

The Public Health Journal

VOL. X.

MARCH, 1919

No. 3

Democracy and Public Health Administration*

By CHARLES J. HASTINGS, M.D., C.M., L.R.C.P.I.

I WISH to express to my colleagues, in the fullest degree, my appreciation of the very high compliment they have paid my country, and incidentally the great honour they have conferred on me, in electing me President of the Association, and I shall take this opportunity to express my appreciation of the most valuable co-operation and assistance of the members of the Executive, the Board of Directors and our worthy Secretary. Unitedly, we have endeavoured to visualize the future of the American Public Health Association.

As my subject indicates, I am going to depart from the well-trodden paths of Presidential addresses. Presidential addresses are not very popular. They are not usually good drawing cards. The most outstanding exception to this, however, was the address delivered by President Wilson in April 1917, when your nation declared war on Germany. That address was most highly appreciated by every intelligent individual in the Allied nations.

The fact that war has been foremost in our minds for over four years, even though the glorious consummation so devoutly hoped for has been attained, justifies, on this occasion, a brief reference to our allied relationship.

The conditions under which our nations entered this great conflict were practically the same. These conditions were fittingly expressed by the Rt. Hon. Mr. Asquith, then Prime Minister of Great Britain, in an address to the British House of Commons, immediately after the declaration of war, in which he said: "No nation ever entered into any great controversy, and this is the greatest that history will ever record, with a clearer conscience and a stronger conviction that it was fighting, not for aggression, not for personal gain, but in defence of principle, the maintenance of which is vital to the civilization of the world". When the

*Address of the President, American Public Health Association, December 9th, 1918.

German Imperial Chancellor learned of Great Britain's intention, he, in a rage, said: "Just for one word 'neutrality', just for a scrap of paper, Great Britain is going to make war on a kindred nation." "I wish you to understand," replied the British Ambassador, "it is a matter of life and death—for the honour of Great Britain—that she should keep her solemn engagement to do her utmost to defend Belgium's neutrality if attacked."—(A Scrap of Paper!)

The Imperial Chancellor could not understand that when Great Britain puts her name to a treaty that she signs it with blood. The German Chancellor well understood that war is hell, but he found it convenient to forget what Dante taught—that the very heart of hell is reserved for those who are traitors to their friends.

When the United States entered this war, she did so in defence of principles. When the United States signs a treaty, she too signs it with blood. I think it was Victor Hugo who said: "A fixed principle is like a fixed star—the darker the night, the brighter it shines."

The reason for this similarity of action of the British Empire and the United States is obvious. The acorns produced by the stalwart oaks of the British Isles, carefully conveyed across the Atlantic and planted on the hillsides of the New England States, removed from the shadow and protecting influences of the mother oak and consequently forced to stand the various tempests and vicissitudes of life, developed the kind of man timber that would not submit to autocratic dictates and coercion but revolted. In doing so, you built more wisely than you knew, as by that revolutionary war, you made it possible for the remaining Dominions of the Empire beyond the Seas to obtain by evolution what you then obtained by revolution. Unfortunately one hears the war of Independence only too frequently referred to as "the war between the United States and Great Britain", instead of "Great Britain's civil war", British fighting against British—a family quarrel.

The conflict that we have just passed through has afforded an opportunity for us to better understand each other.

And now that, in the phraseology of Shakespeare, the black cloud of war that has been lowering upon our house-tops for the past four years or more has been dispersed, and that our bruised arms have been once more, and I hope for all time, hung up for monuments, and our stern alarms changed to merry meetings, it remains for our Association to play its part in medical demobilization at least and in the enlisting of all the physicians who have been specially trained in preventive medicine and also all public health nurses into our army to combat the invisible foes of our race.

For the next three days you will have presented to you, and hear discussed, every phase of Public Health Work, especially the epidemic

that we have just passed through, the future of the American Public Health Association and the future of the American Public Health Service. Consequently, I am going to address you for a few minutes on "Democracy and Public Health". I am going to present a few plain facts and ask you to consider with me their application. The time has come when, if we are going to give our boys the democracy that they have been fighting for, we must face the facts and prepare to deliver the goods.

The True Democracy.—Modern public health administration, as I see it, constitutes the very quarry from which may be hewed the chief corner stones of true democracy. By "true democracy" I mean the "Lincoln Brand" of democracy. The brand of democracy that means liberty and justice for all, and makes possible for every citizen the development and maintenance of a sound mind in a sound body. This is the democracy that our boys have been fighting for—the democracy that, if we are going to keep faith with our boys, we must be prepared to deliver.

Under our present Public Health Administrations, we require people to conform to certain regulations. We endeavour to teach them how to live. We tell them that plenty of nutritious food, fresh air and sunshine are the best and only reliable remedies for tuberculosis and other wasting diseases. We insist on mothers nursing their babes, assuring them that by doing so they give their infants ten chances to one that they would have if artificially fed. But what are we doing to make these things possible?

No democracy existing to-day assures these conditions, except in a fragmentary way, but, thank God, there is evidence on all sides of an awakening of the social conscience to the appalling social conditions existing to-day, with poverty on the one hand and luxurious idleness on the other. What our nations require is a fitter race, and what every individual is entitled to, is the development of the best mental and physical abilities of which he is capable and no government is worthy of being called a democracy that does not make this possible. In the democracies of to-day this is obtainable only for the few, while tens of millions are toiling for a wage which denies them this right.

As General Gorgas said, a few years ago, in an address delivered in Cincinnati: "If he were given only one means by which to improve the health of the people on this Continent, he would choose for that one, the doubling of the revenue of the wage-earner." This of course, to be efficient, would require to be accompanied by a well-organized educational campaign along the lines of thrift.

Is it not time for introspection? Is it not time that we were doing a little political and social stock-taking of our so-called democracies to see if they measure up?

The world has been talking more and thinking more about democracy in the past four years than in centuries before, inasmuch as the great

struggle that we have just passed through has been for the most part for the democratizing of the world, and yet how many of us have taken the trouble to determine what real democracy means?

When one considers the heterogeneous character, however, as regards race, language and traditions of the population of this great Republic, one is forced to conclude that your experiment in democracy has been fairly successful, but like our crowned democracy, it is badly in need of remoulding and must go into the melting pot with the other so-called democracies of the world. We must not be content with anything but the sterling article, the democracy that will stand the acid test. That is what our boys have been fighting for.

The Origin of Democracy.—Democracy is becoming so popular that all are claiming its nativity. Some claim that it was born and cradled on the *Mayflower*. Others that it was born in the manger at Bethlehem of Judea. Others that it first saw the light in Great Britain when John was forced to sign the Magna Charta at Runnymede, while ancient historians give credit for its conception and nativity to Greece and Rome, and I have no doubt that the Israelites would claim that previous to the time of Saul, over 1,000 years B.C., that their government of Theocracy, which incorporated social and religious societies, constitutes the true democracy.

It must be apparent, however, that the efficiency of any democracy depends on the intelligence of the people that go to compose it.

We do not find in the democracy of the United States or the crowned democracy of Great Britain, or any other democracy that exists to-day, "Liberty and Justice for all", or even the political principles of the government of the people, by the people and for the people, but rather the government of the people, by the money for the few, and while democracy does not recognize aristocracy of birth or aristocracy of wealth, yet it does recognize aristocracy of worth.

As Napoleon the First expressed it, "The French Revolution meant a clear pathway for merit of whatever kind." This means giving every man a chance.

In describing democracy, James Russell Lowell said: "I would say that it is that form of society, no matter what the political classification, in which every man has a chance and knows that he has it." "If a man can climb, and feels himself encouraged to climb from a coal pit to the highest position for which he is fitted, he can well afford to be indifferent as to what name is given to the government that makes that possible," for he sees in it Liberty and Justice.

Democracy does not mean equality of men, but of opportunity.—No form of government, however, can make all men equal. The laws of eugenics make this impossible, but true democracy gives every man a chance.

It simply means doing unto others as you would they should do to you. It has taken nearly 2,000 years for the world to properly grasp and turn to practical account the democracy of Christ, which means the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God.

Our nations have for the past four years been pouring out the best of their blood, until practically every foot of land in Northern France and Flanders has been baptized in the best blood of all nations, and garlands of mourning have been thrown around the whole world. We must see to it then, that for this sacrifice, when our boys have returned, that they are not handed an alloy, but the sterling article. That is what they have fought for and are entitled to.

Lincoln obtained his viewpoint when in his teens. Standing in the slave market of New Orleans, penniless as he was, but with a princely heart, he was deeply touched when he saw human flesh and blood bartered at the auction block, and although this was over three decades before he entered the White House, as he left that scene he was overheard to say, "If ever I get a chance to hit that thing, by the Eternal God, I will hit it hard." This was the decision, this was the choice, of the then young deck hand on the flat-bottomed skiff on the Mississippi. Lincoln knew that slavery was incompatible with democracy.

Every nation that permits people to remain under the fetters of preventable disease, and permits social conditions to exist that make it impossible for them to be properly fed, clothed and housed, so as to maintain a high degree of resistance and physical fitness, and that endorses a wage that does not afford sufficient revenue for the home, a revenue that will make possible the development of a sound mind and body, is trampling a primary principle of democracy under its feet.

Will any of the democracies of to-day stand the test? Let us see how far our democracies measure up.

First let us examine the crowned democracy of Great Britain. It is alleged that 30,000 people in England own and control over 98 per cent. of the land and capital of that Island. Just previous to the war, it was estimated that 700,000 men in England were constantly out of work, and 800,000 were practically paupers. Of every 1,000 persons who die in old England, over 900 leave no property behind. Is this democracy? Can we see in this any claim for Freedom and Justice?

The *Manchester Guardian* recently drew attention to the fact that Great Britain, just previous to the war, boasted of 79 multi-millionaires, with 125 million dollars or more to their credit; 68 with well on to 100 millions to their credit and 45 with between 75 and 100 million dollars to their credit, and as the writer expresses it, "On the more poverty-stricken scale, with only 50 millions, there were 19", and then states that

"after this penurial zone is reached, we are quite willing to fall out of the running and let other nations have it".

In an address delivered by the Bishop of London, just three years before the war, at a Church Congress, on "The Duty of the Church To-day", when referring to the unequal distribution of wealth, and the appalling amount of poverty, and to those just living on the border line—not living, only existing—he said that if a procession could be organized of these people in old London, it would take a fortnight to get it out, and before the last couple left London, the first would be in Edinburgh. "We cannot rest, therefore," said the Bishop, "until this irregular distribution is righted. We cannot rest until there is equality of opportunity for as many as possible." And yet the government that makes these conditions possible, we have been styling a crowned democracy."

Coming Nearer Home.—We are told by students of political economy that in the United States and Canada, less than one-half of one per cent. of the people own and control nine-tenths of the entire wealth. It is estimated that this Republic possesses more than one quarter of the entire wealth of the world. And yet on this continent it is alleged that 3,000,000 children go to school either without breakfast or with improper or insufficient food for their breakfast, and at the same time we find in this country thirteen families with an annual income ranging from \$2,500,000 to \$60,000,000, and this is what we call democracy. In the United States and Canada over 10,000,000 people are in a state of chronic poverty, and this is apparently on the increase. There are constantly 4,000,000 paupers. Ninety-nine per cent. of the wage earners in our cities die without leaving any property, and we call this democracy. Is it not man's inhumanity to man?

If we take the Bishop of London's illustration and apply it to our countries, we would find that if it were possible to form a procession of those who are in a state of more or less daily privation, organized at Washington, it would take between three and four months to get the procession out of the city. It would reach from Washington to New Orleans, from New Orleans to San Francisco and from San Francisco to Chicago, and from Chicago back to Washington, and before half this melancholy multitude had left Washington, the first couple would have entered Chicago.

What are we doing to ameliorate these conditions? Doling out colossal sums, yea millions, yearly, as charity, and what has it done? As someone has said, "It has merely anaesthetized or benumbed the poor, lest they cry too loud". Should not the word "charity" as we use it be expunged from our language and the word "justice" substituted? These are the conditions we find in our so-called Christian nations.

As Sir Henry Drummond expressed it: "In the final reckoning, it is the Son of Man before whom the nations of the world will be gathered. It is in the presence of humanity that we shall be charged and the spectacle itself, the mere sight of it, will silently judge each one. Those will be there whom we have met and helped; there the unpitied multitude whom we neglected or despised. No other witness need be summoned. No other charge than lovelessness shall be preferred. "Be not deceived," says Drummond, "the words which all of us shall one day hear sounded are not of theology, but of life; not of church and saints, but of the hungry and the poor; not of creeds and doctrines, but of shelter and clothing; and a cup of cold water in the name of Him who has said, 'Inasmuch'." "But, thank God," said Drummond, "we are coming nearer to the world's needs, and we know better, by a hair's breadth, what real religion is, what God is, and who Christ is"—The great Exponent of Democracy, who preached practical Christianity, the brotherhood of man.

Some seem to think that Socialism is the remedy. I know of no form of Socialism that does not contain sufficient anarchy to condemn it. True democracy is Socialism purged of its anarchy and other objectionable features. If the autocracy of Germany should swing to the other extreme of anarchy, the last state of that nation would be worse than the first. The Socialisms and Bolshevisms of to-day must go into the melting pot with the so-called democracies, from which we may expect to arise the new democracy in which every man will have a chance and know that he has it.

The war has demonstrated, as never before, the value of man power, whether in war or peace. Every nation has been expecting every man to do his duty, and now that the war is over, every man will expect every nation to do its duty. He will expect a democracy that will make possible the development of a sound mind in a sound body, both for himself and his offspring, and will make for him a clear pathway for merit whatever it may be, and in which he will know that he has a chance to climb to the highest position. To this end a new democracy must arise.

The efficient solution of the social problems of our homes constitutes the very foundation of Public Health Administration, inasmuch as the efficient care and nutrition of the expectant mother and the children is governed by the revenue of the home. Health is a pre-requisite to the enjoyment of life. We do not only want life, but we want it more abundantly. As Farrand has expressed it: "To make a country really safe for democracy, we must first make it healthy." We have heard much about making the world safe for democracy, but have we a democracy that is safe for the world? This must be assured.

The brain and brawn of the people represent our organized national capital. Through the steady advance of our industrialism and the

urbanization of our people, their national worth has become more and more apparent. Consequently, in some of the more enlightened communities, the expectant mother now receives almost as much consideration as the Holstein cow and the Berkshire sow, and the infant almost as much consideration as the calf and the pig, not because they are human, not because they are made in the image of their Maker, but because of their national worth, because man power is now being recognized as the nation's greatest asset. Nations have been awakened from a national somnolence so profound that it has required millions, yea billions, of tons of explosives to arouse them.

Our National Fitness.—The fit have had to be separated from the unfit. Consequently we have been taking an inventory of our physical assets, with results that have been amazing. From fifty to seventy-five per cent. of our volunteers, draftees and conscripts have been found physically unfit for military service, and these have been, for the most part, the victims of preventable and curable diseases and physical defects.

Fifty thousand were rejected from your first draft on account of tuberculosis. These had all been engaged in active pursuits, the vast majority having no knowledge of the danger that was lurking within them. Government reports show that sixty-six per cent. of the first million volunteers for the army and navy were rejected as physically unfit. It is true that the physical requirements were high, and were subsequently relaxed, yet they were not higher than they should be to ensure the physical soundness that our people are entitled to, and that in the interests of the nations, should be maintained, whether it be for military or civil service.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that similar results are being found among the school children where a complete physical examination is made on entering the schools, inasmuch as approximately fifty per cent. are found defective and have defects of such a character as to require them to be referred to their family physician or some hospital clinic for correction.

To add to the tragedy which these examinations reveal of pre-war conditions, we find that there have been approximately seven millions of those who have been found fit, of the best man power of all nations, that have paid the extreme penalty, and probably an equal number permanently disabled.

What about the ravages of the invisible foes of the race? What about the conditions that are responsible for those that have been found unfit for active service? What about the conditions that are responsible for the physical defects in our children on entering school? According to the records of the registration areas of all the nations engaged in this war, there have been, previous to the war, over seven million six

hundred thousand people die annually from preventable diseases, or that have paid the extreme penalty in their combat with these invisible foes, and, no doubt, quite as many who have survived the contest, but have been more or less handicapped as a consequence of their struggle for life. Moreover, it must be apparent that the percentage found in the registration areas is less than the areas where there is no registration.

What are we doing to control these invisible foes?

Some effort has been made to safeguard the health of the people since pre-historic times, more particularly among the Egyptians. However, the Levitical laws, as codified by Moses, were the first organized effort to apply the principles of hygiene: district health officers were appointed in Rome in 495 B.C. The Cloaca Maxima constructed in Rome centuries before Christ, and also their aqueducts give evidence of their having recognized the necessity for sewage disposal and for the securing of their water supply from uncontaminated sources. However, it was not until 1847 A.D. that the first health officer was appointed in England. Think of this interregnum of over two thousand years.

This apparent suspension of public health activities was in a large measure due to superstition and doctrinal delusion of the Israelites, who regarded plagues and pestilence as visitations of divine wrath and this superstition has unfortunately been handed down through the centuries of the Christian era. It was this that Ruskin sarcastically referred to when he said: "Any regulations which tend to improve the health of the masses, are viewed by them as an unwarranted interference with their vested rights in inevitable disease and death".

Attend almost any church burial service to-day, and you will hear the officiating parson read from the service: "The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away, Blessed be the name of the Lord". In the light of modern knowledge, can you conceive of anything more libellous on the Almighty? If the church is determined to retain this form, why not change it sufficiently to make it consistent, and have it read: "The Lord giveth and the Municipality taketh away, Cursed be the name of the Municipality."

As an illustration of the inconsistency of this attitude, the mortality from typhoid fever on this continent has been reduced seventy-five per cent. during the past ten years, and from tuberculosis it has been reduced practically fifty per cent. within the past twenty-five years. This means that tens of thousands fewer are dying from these diseases alone every year than would be dying if the death rate of twenty-five years ago obtained to-day, in which case according to the burial service, the Almighty would be to blame for all these deaths.

It is important to note in this very significant reduction of the general typhoid death rate in thirty-five American cities in the past ten years from 27.2 per hundred thousand to 6.7 per hundred thousand, that the

death rate varied in these thirty-five cities from 56.4 to 1.7, this latter figure being for Chicago, which is the lowest of any large city on the continent. This is a wonderful showing. Over 20,000 fewer people died from typhoid last year than would have died if the death rate of 1907 had obtained. Obviously then, we have practically bottled up in our filters, Admiral Typhosus, with his entire navy, and should one of them escape, he is promptly gassed with chlorine.

While this is only one disease, yet it demonstrates the possibilities of preventive medicine, and what can be done by an intelligent application of the knowledge we now possess. It places the blame where it belongs.

I trust that the time is not far distant when if an epidemic of typhoid fever breaks out in any municipality, that can be traced either to the water supply or the milk supply, or any other source that the municipality is responsible for, that those affected will have legal claims for damages, and that our Federal Government will indite such municipalities for manslaughter.

In view of the unqualified success of anti-typhoid vaccine, it would seem that in any municipality where the water and milk are not made at all times safe, that anti-typhoid vaccination should be imperative.

However, even if all preventable diseases were controlled, and their control will require much more intensive work than has been done in the past, we would then be doing but a fraction of the work of Public Health Administration as we now see it, inasmuch as it means the development of a fitter race, the conservation of man power. Therefore, Departments of Public Health are essentially nation building.

It was with a vision of this three-quarters of a century ago, that prompted Disraeli in the British House of Commons to say that "Public health is the foundation upon which rests the happiness of the people and the strength of the nation", and that "The first duty of a statesman is the care of the public health". Oliver Wendell Holmes once said that to produce a perfect gentleman you require to begin with his great grandparents. To produce a fitter race, we must begin with the germ plasm from which they are developed. Eugenists tell us that the moment conception takes place the door of parental gifts is closed. In other words the moment conception occurs the possibilities of eugenics ends. Obviously then, if we are going to have, and if we are going to develop a fit race, we must have a complete chain of activities. There must not be a missing link. Where eugenics ends, euthenics must begin. As Galton expressed it "Where nature ends, nurture begins", and it is only by combining both efficiently that we can hope to develop the fittest race.

While I have a profound respect for the school of Eugenics, yet we must remember that we have no say with regard to the kind of man

timber out of which our ancestors were made, but we have a say, and are responsible for, the man timber out of which our descendants will be fashioned.

Pre-Natal Care.—Every child has a right to be well born—born of parents who are physically and mentally sound. That is to say, they should develop from a germ plasm which is free from any taint that might militate against them. If our organized campaign against the still unduly high infant death rate is to be efficient, obviously it must begin just after conception has taken place. The necessity for this is apparent when we realize that more than one-third of the infants that die, in the first year, die during the first month, and from sixty to seventy per cent. of these die within the first week. Consequently, if these lives are to be saved, it must be by pre-natal care. Here the grim monster reaps his harvest, oftentimes by a dual action directed against both the mother and child. If we would save the baby, we must save and protect the baby's best friend—the mother. There is no other resort that the infant has or can appeal to comparable to the maternal instinct. With no language but a cry, the infant when in distress promptly appeals in this way, which appeal none but the mother can properly interpret.

It is a well-recognized fact that the infant nursed at the mother's breast has ten chances to one for life and efficient development that the artificially fed child has. Consequently our pre-natal care must embrace not only the efficient piloting of the mother through her pregnancy and confinement, but also we must see that, as far as can be, we make it possible for her to nurse her baby.

There is probably no greater reflection on our intelligence as a profession than the fact that, while the death rate from typhoid fever and tuberculosis on this continent has been reduced by more than half in the past twenty-five years, and there has also been a marked decrease in all other preventable diseases, yet there has been no appreciable decrease during the same time in the deaths from diseases due to pregnancy and from conditions accompanying labor. This has been shown to be largely the result of ignorance on the part of patients, and lack of efficient training on the part of the physicians, and their neglect to turn to practical account the knowledge which they possess.

Williams has pointed out the fact that in the majority of Medical Colleges in the United States, instructions in obstetrics is sadly neglected and that consequently the young graduates turned out are incapable of handling any but normal cases, and they only too often failed to intelligently apply the principles of antisepsis and asepsis in this practice.

It is almost inconceivable in the light of modern knowledge that, according to a report recently issued by the Children's Bureau at Washington, pregnancy and child-birth on this continent cause more deaths

among women between fifteen and forty-four years of age than any other disease excepting tuberculosis. Basing our calculations on the records of the registration areas of the United States and Canada, there is approximately an annual mortality of sixteen thousand eight hundred women due to child-birth, and seven thousand five hundred of these deaths are due to so-called child-bed fever. This is undoubtedly a very conservative estimate. These figures cannot be properly appreciated unless we present them in a comparative way. Let us compare them with the death rates from other preventable diseases. For instance, in 1913, the death rate from diseases due to pregnancy and confinement was 15.8 per hundred thousand population, which of course includes all ages and both sexes, and the death rate from puerperal septicemia or child-bed fever was 7.2. In the same year the typhoid death rate was 17.9 per hundred thousand and the death rate from diphtheria and croup 18.8. In the light of modern knowledge of the principles of antiseptic surgery and its application to obstetrical practice, it is nothing short of criminal that such a high death rate should continue.

With efficient pre-natal care, the mother can be guided not only in regard to the necessary precautions to be observed regarding proper nutrition, clothing, exercise, and also she can have pointed out to her the danger signals as regards complications; she can be advised to consult a physician early to obtain examination, and examination again about the seventh month, to determine whether or not any abnormal conditions exist that might militate against her at full time of gestation, to submit samples frequently for testing the activities of the kidneys.

The fact that the infant depends entirely on the mother's blood for nutrition makes it all the more imperative that the blood be kept in the best possible condition, which can only be accomplished by the efficient safe-guarding of the mother's health, in piloting her through her pregnancy. The extreme importance of her nursing her infant should be emphasized. Where efficient pre-natal care has been established, there has been a marked increase in the number of mothers nursing their babies, and the infant mortality during the first month has been reduced more than fifty per cent.

Obviously then, pre-natal care will not only secure a better and more vigorous race of infants, to start life with, but will also tend to improve obstetrical service and thereby save the lives of many mothers that are unnecessarily sacrificed at present.

Furthermore, pre-natal care affords a starting point for the nurse to educate the mother in the intelligent care and feeding of her baby when it arrives. The mothers are instructed in their homes in regard to the care of the infant after its arrival. They are required to bring their infants as soon as they are old enough, to the Well-baby Clinics, which are established in the various districts of our cities, where the babies are

examined by physicians specializing in the care and feeding of infants assisted by Public Health nurses. They are weighed and measured, in order to determine whether or not their development is normal. Any physical defects are recognized and instructions are given regarding their correction.

The next link in this chain of Public Health activities, is the care and supervision of the child in the pre-school age. Probably the most valuable result of Medical Inspection of Schools has been the revelation of the fact that a large percentage of the children on entering the public schools are suffering from physical defects. This has been demonstrated in all cities where the Medical Service in the schools requires the complete physical examination of every child on entering school. Experience has taught that a large number of children, healthy in all respects at birth, become, within five years, physically defective. Municipalities, through their Boards of Education and Departments of Health, are required, at no small cost, to restore these children as far as possible to their original state.

Sir Geo. Newman, in a recent report, has drawn attention to the efforts on the part of educationalists towards a higher standard of physical development, and in this connection he emphasizes the great importance of the early supervision of the homes. By this means, many conditions that are irreparable by the time the child reaches school, could be prevented. While much has been done, as regards pre-natal care and the care of the new-born infant and in medical inspection of school children, little or no organized effort has been made toward the supervision of the child in the intervening age. Hence, a most important field of social and biological study for the most part has been overlooked.

Pre-school Age.—When one considers the plastic character of life at ages say between one and six years, one readily realizes the importance of the efficient supervision during this period. Fortunately this has been recognized by some administrators of public health, who, by organized effort, have stepped into the breach and forged the missing link and welded it into the chain.

The pre-natal care of the child can be satisfactorily linked up with the care of the infant, through the organization of Well-baby Clinics, also in the various Day Nurseries and other institutions where children are kept during the pre-school age.

The fact that on a complete examination approximately fifty per cent. of all children on entering school show signs of some physical defects, exclusive of those of the teeth, sufficiently important to require medical care, points to the absolute necessity of careful supervision during this period of the child's development.

Before the child leaves school, he again undergoes a complete physical examination, which serves a double purpose; first, it serves as a guide to

the child in regard to any physical weaknesses that he may have, in order that he may endeavour by all possible means to reinforce these weaknesses. Also it helps him to determine the vocation in life for which he is best suited.

Industrial Hygiene.—The next link in the activities, is that of a well-organized Division of Industrial Hygiene. This has been another lamentably neglected branch of preventive medicine. Industrial diseases are for the most part preventable. Industrial Hygiene is a part and parcel of community hygiene. Obviously, therefore, it must come under the *regime* of Departments of Public Health and Local Boards of Health in all municipalities. We have safeguarded the child from conception until it enters the industrial world. Why should we discontinue then? We must follow on and see that the industries in which he may engage are so conducted as not to be prejudicial to his health.

When we refer to industrial hygiene and industrial diseases, we embrace, first, the results of the general unsanitary conditions of factories, work shops, work houses, warehouses, badly lighted, over-heated, improperly ventilated, oftentimes with dust-laden atmosphere. The ill effects of fatigue are also taken into consideration. All of which tend to lower the vitality and thereby lower the resisting powers of the body, rendering the individual in many respects more susceptible to diseases to which he may be daily exposed, consequent upon the close contact with probably one suffering from a mild attack of tuberculosis or one convalescing from some communicable disease, who is still a chronic carrier. Furthermore, such environments, if tolerated, only hasten on the fatal issue to those unfortunates who are already the victims of the aforesaid disease, and who, through ignorance of their condition, or the danger of their environment, are through dint of circumstances compelled to face the inevitable.

Then, of course, we have added to this, the morbid conditions consequent upon the occupation or trade, giving rise to specific diseases, such as lead poisoning, phosphorus poisoning, arsenical poisoning, mercurial poisoning, brass poisoning, and poisoning from the fumes of mercurial acids and wood alcohol, and so forth.

Departments of health will find that employers of labour when once educated as to the importance of action along these lines, will readily co-operate. Employers of labour in Toronto have spent tens of thousands of dollars on installing the necessary equipment for the control of trade dusts, and the more efficient ventilation of their industries, knowing as they do, that improper ventilation, with the employees exposed to inhaling trade dust, can easily cut down ten per cent. of efficiency of all their employees, to say nothing of the loss of time through sickness. No employer of labour can afford to pay ten out of every one hundred of his employees for doing nothing, and that is what only ninety per cent.

efficiency really means. Sir Thomas Olliver says that industrial diseases cost this continent over \$779,000,000 annually.

Then we must consider the degenerative diseases of middle life, premature diseases of the heart and arteries, kidneys, and liver, and cancer to which thousands of lives are sacrificed annually, a large percentage of which could be saved if the diseases were recognized early, by preference in the pre-cancer stage and promptly operated upon.

Then we have the neglect of the mental condition of our children and of our adults. Mental Hygiene also is essentially a part of the general community hygiene, for when we use the term hygiene we should use it in the broadest sense, as being synonymous with health. The maintaining of the mind in a healthy condition is surely as important as the maintaining of the body in a healthy condition, and is as deserving of guidance.

Obviously then, linked up with our public health service should be a division of psychiatry or mental hygiene.

Education.—At last, and yet the most important of all activities, of a Department of Health, is education, inasmuch as probably ninety per cent. of the permanent efficiency of Public Health Administration depends on the efficiency of our educational campaigns.

We must in the first place educate the future governors, the future legislators of our community, the future parents of our country, the medical profession, the nursing profession, the clergy, and the legal profession. For the generation to come there is only one efficient way and that is to begin in our schools. Make instructions in Hygiene and Public Health an organized part of the curriculum of every public school, high school, and college.

While we can accomplish much by our public health bulletin, newspaper talks, public addresses, health leaflets, etc., yet we must bear in mind that there are thousands in all of our cities that cannot read, there are thousands of those who can read that do not read, and there are thousands of those who do read that do not think. We are confronted by the lamentable fact that the knowledge essential for our people to be in possession of, as regards disease-producing germs and the ways and means by which they gain access to the body, has been kept for the most part in past years within the precincts of universities and laboratories. This, to be of practical value, must be democratized. It must be translated into a language that will be understood by the man on the street and by the housewife in the humblest home. This can be most efficiently done through the medium of the Public Health nurse, who meets the parents with their children in the Well-baby Clinics, in the Hospital Clinics, in the Tuberculosis Clinics and in the public schools, and visits thousands of homes in our cities every day. In her conversation with the mother in the homes, she can establish the point of contact

and can make these facts so plain "that the wayfaring man or woman, though a fool, need not err therein".

We are sometimes afraid of repeating things too frequently, but anyone who has had any experience along educational lines, must have been fully impressed with the importance of repeating and repeating a number of times, over and over again. This has been the experience all down through the ages. Occasionally we have had outstanding illustrations of this. When Cobden was endeavouring to have the Corn Laws repealed in Great Britain, after repeated efforts, in a spirit of indignation he said that he had come to the conclusion that the only way to get anything through the heads of the British people was to repeat it over and over again, in just a little different language. A few years ago when the subject of education was under consideration at the New York Academy of Medicine, Professor Sir Wm. Osler said that in his judgment the secret of education was reiteration, reiteration, reiteration, to which one of his colleagues added, "without irritation". As I have quoted Cobden and Osler before, you see I am consistent in recommending reiteration. It is certainly an enviable accomplishment to be able to reiterate sufficiently often to leave a permanent impression on the brains of our fellow-citizens without causing irritation.

While the foregoing represent the activities of a well organized Department of Health, there are probably not a half-dozen cities so organized on this continent. We will never obtain the results that our people are entitled to, and that the principles of true democracy dictate, until this kind of organization is in operation in every municipality.

Every citizen on this continent is entitled to this protection and guidance and they are not having justice without it.

It must be apparent then that if this is going to be accomplished, if our activities are to reach into every state and municipality on the continent, all powers and authority for governing this work must be centralized. The greatest determining factor in our winning the war was, by general consent, the appointment of a Generalissimo. What every nation requires in its Public Health Administration, in its organized battle against the invisible foes of the race, is a Foch. We require the centralization of authority. Whether that be a Public Health Service, a Local Government Board, a Department of Health, a Ministry of Health or a Secretary of Health, it matters little, but all authority must be centralized under one department, if we are going to have efficient results. After all these years of warfare against these invisible foes, we have little to boast of beyond a pitched battle.

In the foregoing I have endeavoured to point out the principal rocks and shoals upon which administrators of public health are required to place the beacon lights to guard our people from a mental, moral and physical shipwreck.

The Medical Profession as a Public Service for Health

P. H. BRYCE, M.A., M.D.

Medical Officer, Department of Immigration and Colonization

IN all the ferment of ideas brought about by the war, there is nothing, except it is an International Peace Conference, which bears more directly upon the welfare of mankind, than questions dealing with the utilization to the highest degree possible of the scientific knowledge, which is the peculiar possession of the medical profession. We have only to recall how the lack of knowledge in the exact sciences for two thousand years, made possible absurd beliefs, in relation to the origin and development, not only of man, but also of plants and animals, which after the time of Darwin, Wallace, and others of that constellation of scientific workers as Tyndall, Huxley, Pasteur, and Lister, made free the highways for the passing of scientific workers, even though the roads were sometimes rough and a toll had to be paid.

Some of us have lived long enough to recall the attacks upon the teachings of Pasteur and the cynical doubts cast upon the methods of Lister, even as late as 1880, and are in a position to measure in some degree the progress in medical science since then. But it would be foolish not to recognize that in the profession, as in international politics, individualism in thought and a lack of co-ordinated action have been direct hindrances to common action for the advancement of civilization and the social benefit of humanity. Last July Sir Bertrand Dawson, Physician-in-Ordinary to the King, set forth in the Cavendish Lectures his views on the Nation's Welfare by outlining a plan for co-ordinating all the public and private institutions engaged in caring for the lives of the British people, which created intense interest and aroused much serious discussion. At a meeting of medical women in London recently, the situation of the profession was discussed and Dr. Jane Walker spoke of the difficulties of private practice, of the insanitary homes, of the poor, remuneration for work done, of the difficulty of making an adequate number of visits in many cases of illness, and of the powerlessness of physicians to cope with the housing evils, resulting in insanitation and over-crowding.

Remarks were further made regarding the inroads on private practice through State treatment of tuberculosis and of venereal

diseases, and through the work being done by child welfare and maternity clinics; while it was pointed out how any organized team work of specialists became of little use except for the rich.

Sir Bertrand Dawson in his lecture, set out by postulating three main points:—(1) That much disease is preventable; (2) That there is a growing sense that health is of supreme interest to the State; and (3) That the best means for preserving health and curing disease should be available for every citizen, by right and not by favour; and ventures to think that this last will be an article of faith of every political party.

It will be conceded by every true Canadian that Sir Bertrand's postulates are unassailable, and hence it seems only necessary to outline what seems to be some practical scheme for consideration which will be applicable to conditions in Canada.

As Ontario is the most populous and highly developed Province in social legislation, it is worth while trying to find what existing conditions are there and what new methods are applicable. The Annual Report for 1915, informs us that there were 91 public hospitals, 68 private hospitals and 108 Homes and Refuges distributed throughout the Province in some 70 municipalities. In the public hospitals there were treated 85,759 persons, but no record exists of those treated in the 68 private hospitals. There were 6,206 inmates of refuges, 4,850 of orphanages, and some 2,000 in County Houses of Industry. In addition to these institutions, there are some 800 Local Boards of Health, and many of them control contagious disease hospitals. On the basis of the City of Ottawa hospitals some 12,233 contagious disease cases were officially dealt with in these hospitals throughout the Province.

Apart from those treated in contagious disease hospitals, there were roughly, 100,000 persons, or one in every 27 of the population in the several classes of institutions, which received government aid. Perhaps a more correct idea is gained of the cost of disease when it is stated that the 2,087 patients in the eleven sanatorias cost \$478,598.22, of which the Province paid \$123,229.30.

No figures have been collected to show the cost of contagious diseases to the people; but, perhaps, some idea may be gained from the figures of a single city. Thus in Ottawa, with 100,000 population, 453 persons were admitted to the isolation hospital, with an aggregate of 9,088 hospital days. At \$1.50 per day the cost would be \$13,632.00, and if it be assumed that a similar prevalence and cost existed throughout the Province, there would have been in Ontario 12,235 cases treated in hospitals, with a cost of \$438,064.00

for maintenance alone, to the municipalities. To these hospital figures must be added the cost of invalidity benefits, paid by Mutual Insurance Companies, amounting to \$1,136,669.80 for 11.5 days' sickness for a total membership of 135,372.

The above figures give a fairly comprehensive illustration of how to-day very large amounts of public and private funds are being spent, often with very indifferent results, for the benefit of a very small number, indeed, of the people at large. If the Friendly Societies' Reports be accepted as a standard, then it means that each of the 2,700,000 population of Ontario would be sick 11.5 days, of whom, adopting the results of a New York district survey, 79 per cent. were under medical treatment. This would mean, if there were 2,000 physicians in Ontario, that each one would make, every day in the year, 35 visits, which at \$1.00 per visit amounts to \$24,840,000.00 for medical services alone. It may be that this amount is not far from the fact; but as regards cost it is obvious that over \$12,000.00 for each of two thousand physicians is greatly in excess of the average receipts of each. What is more to the purpose, however, is that the official returns of the Friendly Societies give as the cost of medical attendance upon 135,372 members, each of which had 11.5 days of sickness, a total sum of only \$96,624.34, or 16 cents per diem, assuming that each sick person received 11.5 days' treatment.

It does then seem as if Sir Bertrand Dawson's scheme, or some similar one must eventually be adopted in the interests, both of the people, of the profession, and of science. Sir Bertrand's scheme in a word would link up all our hospitals, charities and public health services into a great scheme under general government and municipal control, with special hospitals and clinics, and all the machinery incident to the public health service completely co-ordinated. Every physician would be attached to some hospital, and so obtain all the advantages of means for exact and early diagnosis, and be paid in part out of public funds for work, as is now done under the Sickness Insurance Act in England. Young graduates would be all-time men in hospitals for five years, paid reasonable salaries, and there be trained over such a period that all the advantages gained from special training would inure to the advantage of all.

The vision is from the scientific and social standpoint a pleasing one, and both the public and the medical profession may well welcome such an advance in the evolution of the social organism as must prove of the greatest benefit to the individual, an enormous saving of effective energy due to a healthy population, and the greatest of all guarantees of a national prosperity.

The Social Background.

The Social Welfare Congress

Toronto, January 16th, 1919.

AFTERNOON SESSION

—AND—

EVENING SESSION.

ADDRESSES BY:—

TOM MOORE, ESQ.

H. C. GOOD, ESQ.

DR. SAMUEL ZANE BATTEN

RECONSTRUCTION IN INDUSTRIAL LIFE.

TOM MOORE

President, Trades and Labour Congress

A REPRESENTATIVE from one of the newspapers waited upon me and asked me whether I could give him any outline as to what I was going to speak about this afternoon. I told him that if he knew that, he knew more than I knew myself, because I had absolutely no idea. I want to say that I came into this hall with a perfectly free and open mind as to what I may say, simply feeling that the subject matter that I might have in mind would be similar to your own, that is, how the greatest degree of human happiness can be brought in this period to each and every individual citizen of this country, whether he be rich or poor.

I have just come from a luncheon convened by the Salvation Army, where I have spoken to many of the captains of industry in this city, relative to that particular campaign. I mention this here, because I was proud to have the opportunity of talking to a meeting of that kind. In that meeting were representatives of all the social phases of our community; there were representatives of all classes of life, and it showed to me that the spirit of co-operation, which existed during the war period, is still possible of existence

in the period which we are facing. With a spirit of co-operation we have got to meet the problems of the future, and those problems are none the less small because they are in the future.

Some of the problems are already with us. We see on all sides the spread of unrest; some people may turn parts into a revolution; we certainly desire a very rapid evolution in some sections of the community. When we see these things we have naturally got to ask ourselves, What is the reason that such exists? How is it that people who are looked upon as good respectable citizens, make statements to-day which some people look upon with species of horror?

I am not going to take this opportunity of criticizing the speaker who went before me. I have had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Parsons on more than one occasion, and I want to say that the greatest of friendship exists between us, not only personally, but between the two organizations, which he and I, respectively, represent. The only trouble which exists is this, that each one looks at life from his own viewpoint, according to the environment in which he has been brought up, and in listening to Mr. Parsons this afternoon, I noticed that, like myself, he was unable to drag himself away entirely from the environment where he exists, and the solutions of the problems were dealt with upon the prosperity of the particular section which he himself represented. I say this with all good feelings, knowing how difficult it is to divorce our particular viewpoint from the problems of life. Therefore, if in my expressions I show myself somewhat prejudiced in favor of the workers, you must understand that my life has been spent amongst them; that I have seen their troubles and privations, and I know some of the dread with which some of them are looking forward, not to the years to come, but the days to come. It is useless for us to gloss over the situation, and to say they have had good wages in the past. It is useless for us to gloss over the situation by saying that in the days to come preparations are being made whereby they will be given an opportunity to be usefully employed. They know that the opportunity does not exist to-day. They know that the necessity for existence is the same with them as it was in the years 1914, 1915, 1916, and 1917.

Our Government thought fit, during the war period, to declare it a crime to be unemployed; it was punishable by imprisonment to be found walking the street without useful employment, and to what purpose was that employment to be performed? For the purpose of destruction—necessary destruction, I admit; destruction

which we could not avoid if we were to purify the world of autocracy and Kaiserism. Therefore, I do not want my criticism of the method of employment to be misconstrued. I admire the spirit of sacrifice which carried the war through to a successful conclusion. I realize and appreciate the necessity of the war being carried on, and I realize that the class which I represent, were, perhaps, more fully represented than any other class, and made possible the final outcome of victory in the great struggle which we have just passed through.

At the same time, if it is possible that society can be so constructed that during periods of that description, every man can be usefully employed, then how are you going to convince the masses of people it is impossible that they should be usefully employed in times of peace? What argument can you adduce to tell a man it is necessary he should walk the streets because some factory door is not open? to tell him he should cease to feed his children? and that his wife should have none of the comforts with which she has been surrounded during the period of war, if he has been well employed? I tell you there is no argument. The workers of to-day do not desire charity; they never have wanted charity; they want sympathetic co-operation towards achieving the ideals which they themselves have struggled for during the generations which have passed.

We are here enjoying our liberties because of the unrest of the mass of the people who have gone before us, because of their insistence on rights of free speech, however, unorthodox their speech may have been. I am not going to repeat the statement of Peter Wright last night, where he drew attention to some of the great performances of the past, where men were killed for their democratic ideas, and when we are demanding the same of the great revolutionary spirits to-day, we had better be careful, because, perhaps, we simply have not yet gone as far in our ideals as those particular people. I do not know that their doctrines are right, but I want to be big enough to give any individual the same right of expression, which I myself possess.

At the same time we must recognize that there is a dividing line between liberty and license. The liberty of the individual must be curtailed when it interferes with the liberty of the masses, but in that the greatest toleration must exist, and it is unfortunate at this particular time, when toleration should be exercised, that the minority of the people to-day have set upon themselves the task that they are correct, and the repressive measures should be put

into force against not only the written words, but as far as possible the thoughts of those who may be in defiance of themselves. No possible machinery has ever been created in the world which hinders the forces of progress; if they are wrong, give them publicity and analysis, and we will soon find out.

I have confidence in the human race; I have confidence that the same judgment of what is right and wrong still exists in the great mass of the people which God created, without having it justified by the minority of any section of the country. I realize this fact platitudes; it would be easy for me to say a number of things that in speaking to-day, it would be easy for me to utter a lot of which would be pleasant to listen to, and pleasant to read, but I deem it necessary at this particular time, in fact, at all times, that men and women should speak their minds, should say frankly what they believe, and should say it boldly and without fear and be men amongst men. Therefore, I prefer to take the little time at my disposal to speak to you candidly and openly regarding facts as they exist at this particular time.

Having perhaps transgressed a little in that particular direction, you may say, In what way are the organized labor forces in this country doing anything towards alleviating conditions which exist? It is all right for us to speak in general terms that certain things should prevail; it is all right for us to say that we should have better conditions, but unless we can get down to a constructive basis and can show there is something greater than just mere phrases, we fail in our mission in life, and if the labor people have nothing more to put before the people at this time than to say that the world should be better than it is, then we are useless so far as the betterment of conditions is concerned. But if we look back at history, we will find that the labor forces have not failed in the past to do their duty in putting forth constructive measures. It is true that many times they have gone a little ahead of their time, but it is practically true of all the great reforms, which have sooner or later been incorporated in the laws of the country, that they have had their birth in the minds of the workers themselves.

Look at some of the things which do exist. Take the Hydro-Electric proposition and public ownership, and you will find that the labor forces were in the field as early as any with the suggestion that capital could be owned by the Government as well as by the individual. They have proven that, and if we are to have anything like social contentment in this country, Government ownership must go farther than that.

We fail to see why the worker should be told that there is no employment for him while many of the resources of this country are tied up because it is profitable to some individual that they should be held until a time when a greater remuneration would be derived. We fail to see why many of the public works should be withheld, simply because the gambling possibility is that in the near future prices may be a little lower, and therefore the tax required to pay for the maintenance of those public utilities will be a little lower for the classes that have to pay the taxes. If private capital will not launch out, if private capital will not assume its duty to provide work for those who are desirous of working. I want to say that it is an old acknowledged fact that there is only a very narrow line between the man who is refused work and the man who ultimately refuses to work. It is not hard for the man who is made a loafer to become an actual loafer in the years to come. Then you must give an opportunity of work to all honest workers—and they are the majority, by a long way. And I will tell you that the workers, as a whole, desire to work for their living; and if private capital fails in its opportunities, if it fails by any measure—whatever the reason may be—then the people as a whole must step in and provide that right, to work for the men and women who are desirous of working.

I was very interested to read in that particular respect, that in the little country of Switzerland they have managed to pass a law whereby no employer shall be allowed to lay off any section of his workers for lack of work or economic changes, until he has reduced the number of hours for all those in his employ. If it is reduced 10 per cent. of the number of hours which he at present employs his workers, then the worker suffers the loss; if it is reduced beyond that amount, then compensation must be paid to the worker for the loss of time. Who contributes this fund? Not the employer himself, but the Federal Government contributes one-third. The Canton, which is the Province here, contributes one-third, and the industry contributes one-third. We have made the mistake of saying that the employer contributes it, but all such contributions are placed as an operating fund by the employer and charged up accordingly. Therefore, I prefer to say that the industry, as a whole, contributes the remaining third.

I do not say at this time, without an investigation, that it would be practical to put that in operation in Canada, but I do want to say to you that it would be possible to considerably reduce the number of hours that the average factory employee in this country

is worked at the present time. We have too many factories working on the ten-hour work-day, and that injustice to the working class of this country ought to be removed.

You may not know it, but there are 1,250,000 workers on the North American continent enjoying the eight-hour working day. The United Brotherhood, during 31 years of existence, have accomplished the reduction of working hours to an eight-hour day and 44-hour week for 286,000 workers, and other organizations have been striving to that end. The greatest authorities of our time tell us that the maximum production of any worker is reached at the end of eight hours, or 44 hours per week, and yet we find that there are too many employers in this country still going on with their long working day, and there are some employers who have actually laid off men, and increased the length of the working day at this particular time in the history of our industrial life. Therefore, although the Swiss scheme may not be practical, there is a way open by the reduction down to a reasonable number of hours. I do not want to say the eight-hour day is the ultimate desire of the worker, but I want to say, with the introduction of the eight-hour day, almost 10 per cent. of the present unemployment of this country could be absorbed, and yet nothing is being done.

Then coming along from that standard of the working day, let us see what it means to the social life of the community. I do not know how many there may be present in this room who have attempted to work ten hours a day—not in an office—but in a factory, from one year's end to another, and year after year within its confines. Do you realize what that means to the woman at home? She has got to be up early in the morning, and when her husband returns in the evening, at six or half past, or seven, she has the supper to serve and the dishes to wash, and by that time where are the children? They are sent to bed. The father sits with his wife, too tired to discuss anything; too tired to bother what happens to his children at school, too tired for anything except that he must go to bed for the purpose of rest that he may be in condition to hold his job the next day. That is what the ten-hour day means. When we get down to the eight-hour day, we have a little opportunity when a man may spend a little time with nature in his backyard. It was almost amusing, and yet tragic to hear the appeals for men to grow things in their own backyards, men who were working ten or eleven hours a day. How are we to face the conditions of the future or take any interest in social welfare, if the working day must not be judged by the ability of the man to stand it, and whether the working day is in the interest of production.

With the speeding up of machines, with the substitution of human power by machine power, with the growing education of the nations to whom we used to sell, they are becoming the producers themselves. Years ago, we used to send Japan ships and machinery; to-day they are building them themselves. If we continue working the same number of hours, if we continue using our high pressure machinery, it means either that the workers must considerably increase their purchasing power, which means higher wages, which means broadening the markets and buying more than is necessary, and when that limit is reached it means this: That you have produced more than you could actually consume in this world, and when you have done that, what occurs? We all know only too well. The employer says: "I have no longer a market, therefore I can no longer employ you." And the worker says: "I am no longer employed, therefore I can no longer purchase," and the merchant tells the man, "I can no longer order," and instead of shortening the hours, we launch hundreds of workers into idleness, until the starving forces open the doors of the factory once more.

I see Lord Leaver, one of the largest employers in the world, says that six hours work is sufficient to produce at a profit all that is necessary in this life.

When we get the shorter working day and the shorter working week, give a man in addition to Sunday, when he should and ought to attend to spiritual matters, give him an opportunity of another day, whereby he can go out into the country and see some of the creations of Nature; whereby he can broaden his mind between the narrow channel of home and factory, and if you give him that opportunity, you are making him a better citizen.

The prosperity of the country does not rest with the wealth of the few and the ignorance of the many. It rests with the happiness and the education of all, whether they be rich or whether they be poor. (Applause.) The universities of our country must be open to the humblest boy; it must be made possible that the worker shall have leisure to become conversant with the conditions of to-day. Therefore, when laboring forces ask for the shorter work day, they do it because they believe the creations of the mind of the people, the inventions of machinery, were not meant for the extra accumulation of profits, were not meant to bring disaster to them, but were meant to bring a more even life, greater opportunities, and greater pleasure for themselves and for their families.

This is, perhaps, a little in the future. We find in the factories of Montreal that there are some 2,500 women working, and

their children have to be taken care of by charity. We are asking to-day that pensions be given to mothers. In 1912 in Guelph, Mrs. Rose Henderson, of Montreal, introduced this particular subject, and I want to say that those whom she asked were shocked, because it seemed so much in the future, and she explained to the gathering of Trades and Labor Congress in Guelph, what she had found of the conditions in connection with her work as Probation Officer in the Civil Courts of Montreal. The labor movement started from that day forward with an active campaign in that regard, and I feel proud to say that almost all the social forces of to-day are advocating that the mothers should be pensioned from the revenue of this country.

We can see that if these mothers were given an opportunity of staying home with their children and bringing them up with a mother's care, that would take out of these factories in Montreal, as competitors with the bread winners, over 2,500 women, and in other cities such action would eliminate some of the competition which to-day exists.

There has been a tendency in the past to have too much competition. I was in hopes that the war had shown the manufacturer as well as the worker that co-operation was far preferable to competition. I was in hope that the old world-wide policy of going after each other and seeing how they could grab a market from one another, would be eliminated; that the forces of the world would get together in some manner whereby you could find out what is actually consumed, and produce accordingly. I am not yet pessimist to the point where I think it cannot be done, but we must go courageously forward, just as those boys went courageously forward to what they looked on as ultimate destruction—as Captain Carpenter told us about the men who went to the Zeebrugge Blockade, and yet came away alive.

I say you must take the chance of destruction on purpose to get construction. We must get rid of the old way of looking at things, and assuming this may lead to disaster and the other may lead to disaster, and assuming that we cannot live unless we do this, and the other, because we did it in the past. That will get us nowhere except to the brink of revolution, and the disaster which we are all trying to eliminate.

If you will go around and see some of the men who are unemployed, they will tell you that men who do not desire to do anything but what is prescribed by the law, are to-day being brought nearer to the verge of destruction and are being brought nearer to the

point where they are ready to steal on purpose that their families shall have food. From this epidemic of influenza that spread over the country, when it was in the height of prosperity, what did you find in the homes of many of the people in these large cities? I have heard many state what they found, and I venture to say there are plenty here who undertook the noble work of alleviating disaster and suffering in the workers' homes who found out that some of the things which I am telling you are not all theory, but actually exist, even during times of so-called prosperity in our Canadian life.

In conclusion, I want to say this, that there are so many things to which we are looking forward. We want to see the worker given shorter hours so that he can develop. We want free education and free text books. We want government by the people, and not by Order-in-Council. (Applause.) We want also the right of the mother to look after her own children. We want all these things, and why? Not from any selfish motive; it is not that we want personal aggrandizement; it is simply that the great foundation underlying it all is this: that the prosperity of a country must not be judged by the turn-over of the banks or the percentage which any manufacturing institutions pass; it must not be judged by the number of automobiles on its streets—as I saw a circular issued from Detroit. These things are not the prosperity of a country, but a prosperous country is one where the people from all corners of the earth desire to come, not because of its attractive posters, but because they know the people living in that country are enjoying the best of life, the greatest of opportunities, and the privilege of recreation with nature, and they feel they do not wish to leave it for any other country in the world. When you get that, you get down to the foundation of patriotism—everybody in the country given equal opportunities, given health and happiness and some of the sunshine which God Himself created.

Reconstruction in Industrial Life

ADDRESS BY H. C. GOOD, FARMER.

THE past century has been one of unparalleled human achievement, but its dominant civilization has, in all essential and primary respects, failed. In spite of the rapid spread of professed religion, and the development of those means of travel and communication which might naturally be supposed to cultivate

friendly relations between neighboring peoples, the century has ended with the most destructive and most tragic war of all history, wherein millions of the best and strongest of humanity have been slaughtered by their fellowmen. In spite of the amazing increase in man's productive power, brought about by the development of applied science, millions more, chiefly women and innocent children, have literally starved to death. And in spite of the wonderful progress in sanitation, hygiene and medicine, disease and pestilence—"The sword of the destroying angel"—have also slain their millions. All the larger warring nations emerge from the wreckage with their manhood slain, their productive capital wasted away and their institutions either broken down or strained to the utmost. The war is over—in a sense—but the starvation, anarchy and bankruptcy which have fallen like an avalanche upon Europe contain untold possibilities for evil; for enduring peace can come only with good will, and of the latter there is little enough to meet the crisis. Knowledge has come without wisdom and the material bankruptcy that now looms imminent is but a symptom of the moral bankruptcy which has made 19th century civilization, in many respects, an imposing and ostentatious mockery. Hundreds of years ago we were enjoined by Him whom we regard as the Highest and Best to "seek first the Kingdom of God and His Righteousness and all these things (material blessings) would be added." And we were further told that "Everyone therefore which heareth these words of Mine, and doeth them, shall be likened unto a wise man which built his house upon the rock; and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not; for it was founded upon a rock. And everyone that heareth these words of Mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand; and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and smote upon that house; and it fell; and great was the fall thereof."

We have built upon the sand, have we not? When the rain descended and the floods came and the winds blew our house fell; "and great was the fall thereof." Hence is it that *Reconstruction* is now our theme and duty. Shall we not, then, aim to be like him who built upon the rock,—the rock of Righteousness, for there is no other foundation of an enduring social or industrial life. It is only upon justice that we can safely rebuild. It is folly to temporize, or to compromise with the powers of evil. Our allegiance to Right must be clearcut and complete. "What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk

humbly with thy God." This, friends, is the key to Reconstruction, —the only foundation on which an enduring civilization can be built.

I wish secondly to direct your attention, very briefly, to the two great forces of *competition* and *co-operation*, which have acted and reacted upon one another throughout human history. Henry Drummond in his "Ascent of Man," has dealt lucidly with them under the names of *Egoism* and *Altruism*, and I commend that work as one of unusual significance to the student of history. Altruism is not peculiar to mankind alone, but is distinctive of all which is properly called human. Co-operation is divinely constructive; competition is destructive; and the latter is useful only in weeding out inferior types of the former. Co-operation is intrinsically higher, better and more powerful; unquestionably it is destined to survive. Naturalists have often drawn attention to the lion as typifying egoism and competition, whereas the antelope, which has multiplied amazingly in the face of constant leonine attacks, typifies altruism and co-operation. Weak and helpless individually, the latter is yet relatively strong and safe through co-operation. Similarly in the sphere of human affairs we have seen the co-operative industrial society supplant the individual competitive trader because of the economics that are inherent in the co-operative method. And have we not just witnessed a most wonderful example of the strength of co-operation, in the manner in which the Allies have won the war!

Now the question arises as to whether we shall attempt reconstruction in industrial life along competitive lines or whether we shall definitely, courageously and persistently adopt the higher, better, more divine method of co-operation, and take as our business motto not "Every man for himself" but rather "Each for all and all for each."

In the third place permit me to express briefly my personal conviction that Democracy, for which this great war has been ostensibly fought, is divinely ordained, and destined to supplant and survive all other forms of Government. I do not, of course, believe that vox populi is always vox dei; but I do believe that democracy is the only vital system of Government; that it only contains within itself the seeds of growth and progress; and that with all its admitted weaknesses it is yet the only thing ultimately worth while in the relation of the individual to the State. A child must creep before it can walk, and walk before it can run. So the art of self-government, the only conceivably just system where citizens have equal rights, is acquired only by trial and experiment. I believe,

therefore, without further amplifying the argument, that democracy has been vindicated by history and that it is as intrinsically superior to other forms of Government as co-operation is superior to competition.

Reconstruction, therefore, must be based upon co-operation and democracy, both working out the divine law of justice. "Equal opportunities for all, special privileges for none," and "Do unto others as ye would they should do unto you."

Permit me now to make application of the foregoing principles to two great concrete industrial problems, that confront us, and if I seem to go far afield, bear in mind that we Canadians have few problems that are not connected with similar problems elsewhere.

The first problem that I wish to mention is the relationship between so-called Labor and Capital, or, more broadly, the threatened war of industrial classes. Who would have believed, five years ago, that such an avalanche of bloodshed, devastation and famine could have suddenly descended upon the earth? Nevertheless, the Satanic powder was there, ready for the match to be touched to it, and some fool set it off. A spurious and un-Christian nationalism bore its natural fruit. So it may be now, that the world is, so to speak, skating over thin ice in the sphere of industrial relations, and that the war of nations which has raged during the last four years is but a prelude to an industrial war, whose consequences may be terrible and far-reaching. A few months ago Mr. W. L. MacKenzie King, who has made an exhaustive study of industrial relations, stated that we were sitting on the edge of a volcano; and indeed, recent events in Europe prove the accuracy of his forecast. Canadian conditions are, perhaps, more like those in the United States than elsewhere, and it will be interesting, therefore, if I refer to the report of the Commission on Industrial Relations, appointed by the President of the United States, in 1912, whose final report was issued in 1915. This commission, after an extended investigation, finds four main sources of dangerous industrial unrest:

1. Unjust distribution of wealth and income.
2. Unemployment and denial of an opportunity to earn a living.
3. Denial of justice in the creation, in the adjudication and in the administration of law.
4. Denial of the right and opportunity to form effective organizations.

I do not propose here to go into the details of this report, a volume of over 400 pages, which will repay the most careful study.

But I do desire to emphasize as much as I can the nature of the causes which the investigation discovered. They can be briefly classed under one heading: *Social Injustice*; and I submit that Reconstruction in Industrial life will be impossible on such a basis. As is said, no question is settled until it is settled right, and we might as well face the situation boldly. Just now Europe is seething with anarchy, and we are not free in this country from the spirit of lawlessness—in high places, as well as in low. This condition and this menace is as much a result of industrial exploitation as of anything. Even the illiterate Russian peasant is dimly conscious that there is something radically wrong when he sees idleness living in ostentatious luxury, while his long hours of slavish toil bring but a pittance—scarcely enough to keep body and soul together. Read of social conditions in France during the 18th century, so vividly portrayed by Dickens in his "Tale of Two Cities." Little wonder that the trodden worm turned, and, as Carlyle relates in his "History of the French Revolution," tanned the hides of its former masters to make shoes for children who had long gone barefoot. We read of this with a shudder; but even now similar or worse things are happening in Russia. The privileged classes, innocent and guilty alike, are reaping what they have sown, a terrible harvest from the evil seed of industrial exploitation. And we, too, shall not escape a like penalty if we permit the same causes to work unchecked in this country. I have no commendation for Bolshevism, as we understand that term, but I have sufficient insight to recognize its prime cause in the selfishness of the privileged classes. Carlyle, in one of his books, tells of a poor widow in England, who appealed for help to some of her well-to-do-neighbors, and being denied this, wandered about in dirt and poverty until she contracted typhus. From her sickness many others were infected and seventeen died—an awful if eloquent proof of her sisterhood. So it is everywhere and at all times for "The mills of God grind slowly. Yet they grind exceedingly small."

Now I have two suggestions to make in connection with the problem of Industrial Relations.

I submit first that without the spirit of good-will no solution is probable, or even possible. And in this respect I conceive it to be the unique privilege and duty of the Christian Church to be the vehicle through which the Grace of God may preserve and strengthen us in this time of trial. I do not wish to be censorious, but it does seem to me that there has been, and is yet, too much of a spirit of smug satisfaction about the visible church, and in this

connection I beg leave to quote with approval the following editorial from the Witness:—

In the presence of the many stupendous world issues that are coming to a head; in the presence of the infinitely complicated problems before the approaching congress; in view of the very crude moral attitude of the nations toward those issues; in view of the volcanic upheavals of the peoples, what do we see? Do we see the Christian Church everywhere upon its knees praying that in this the great day of the Lord, God's Kingdom may come and His Will be done on earth? Or do we find congregations blandly thanking God that He has crowned our honorable arms with victory, with apparently no sense of the supreme crisis, social and international, the solution of which has been Providentially thrust upon the nations of to-day and really depends on what sort of a heart there is in these nations? Is this not the time to inspire the nations, each within itself with a right spirit; to put in our litanies; "From all pride; from all vengefulness; from all self-seeking; from all that would breed hatred between man and man; Good Lord, deliver us?" Should the church not be following the rulers of men to their infinitely important task with a consecrating breath of prayer for them? Or does it believe at all in the potency of such things, or in its responsibility with regard to them?

The present industrial situation surely issues a challenge to the Church!

My second suggestion is that any final solution of the problem of industrial relations will involve a substantial reunion of capitalist and laborer. In this connection I speak with some authority, because I am engaged in practically the only industry in which "Labor" and "Capital" have not been divorced. In the main farmers unite in themselves the three functions of landowner, capitalist, and laborer; and there is, therefore, neither schism or friction. The farmer labors long and hard that he may save,—that he may store up capital and reap the fruits thereof. Everything in such a case conspires to promote the fundamental virtues of industry, sobriety and thrift. This happy condition did at one time prevail largely in other industries. But with the advent of the age of machinery and the development of the factory system a condition arose in which the land (or natural resources) was owned by one set of men—in some places inherited from feudal times—the capital (or tools of production) was owned by another set; and the labor was

supplied by still a third class. Hence arose wonderful opportunities for economic exploitation, and, if you will but recognize it, a world wide discrimination in matters of legislation in favor of those industries (mostly urban) where this opportunity was greatest. Hence grew vast fortunes on the one hand, and the perpetuation of poverty and ignorance on the other. Industrial Reconstruction, if it is not again to tumble in ruins must change all this, and it seems to me that the union of landowner, capitalist and laborer in the same person, which works out so beneficially in agriculture, will have to be re-established in other industries. This is no easy problem, and will not be solved over night. We might better tackle it sooner rather than later, however; and I will indicate briefly the broad lines along which, I think, such progress will proceed.

There will be, in the first place, the putting of everyone in the position of landowner by appropriating the "unearned increment" for society—"community values for community purposes." There will be, in the second place a considerable development of state socialism, or better, of public ownership of public utilities. And in the third place, there will be, I feel certain, a vast development of what is known as voluntary co-operation,—of what Lord Roseberry called "a state within a state." In these three directions I think we shall see the reunion of those functions or forces whose separation has had no little effect in bringing about the present world catastrophe.

And, now, I come to the second great concrete problem that we have to consider in the Programme of Reconstruction—the problem of *Production*—of efficient and abundant production. This problem is of special importance to Canada, because we have now a foreign debt of between four and five billion dollars, on which the interest charges alone will run up in the neighborhood of 200 millions a year. We can save ourselves from national bankruptcy only by securing a vastly increased production, and that in those lines only where we can produce profitably. As Mr. Drury said at the last annual convention of the United Farmers of Ontario: "To produce commodities for ourselves which we can more cheaply buy abroad must necessarily result in diverting capital and labor from profitable industry to unprofitable, as well as burdening profitable industry with the extra cost of the commodities produced." And as he said further: "It becomes clear that as in the time of war just past, it was the part of wisdom to close down or restrict all unessential industries in order that our energies might be devoted to those necessary to the winning of the war, so in the

time of reconstruction when our chief business will be to meet our obligations and maintain our solvency, it will be absolutely necessary to see that unprofitable industries, that is those that cannot produce as cheaply as their products may be sold for in the world's markets, do not become a clog to profitable industries, that is to those industries whose products we may hope to sell in the world market at a profit."

Now in this connection I take issue absolutely and irrevocably with all those who advocate tariffs as a means of stimulating production. Such devices may, it is true, increase production in this special line or in that; but on the whole they have the very reverse effect; they divert labor from profitable to unprofitable industries and thereby lessen the net total result. Surely no man in his senses would advocate the culture of bananas in Canada unless, possibly, bananas were a commodity whose loss might at some future time be fatal to our existence. Everyone would admit that a unit of labor spent in the production of wheat, for which our conditions are suitable, would be vastly more effective than in the production of bananas. And yet the argument, whose validity in this extreme case is obvious to everyone, is equally valid of all industries which need tariff protection for their continued existence. They are a clog upon the nation's industries, and the labor employed in them would be more advantageously employed elsewhere. The philosophy of protection is patently fallacious, for if the restrictions involved therein produce scarcity they are socially injurious, while if they do not produce scarcity they are non-effective and useless to those who want them. But the real reason why protection has such staunch advocates is that it creates an artificial scarcity, and thereby puts money into the pockets of those producers whose products are affected. No just scheme of reconstruction can countenance the continuance of this system, as it is, as has been often said, simply "legalized robbery." The folly of tariffs becomes all the more apparent if we narrow the territorial boundaries—what a nuisance and terrible loss, for example, would be involved in the erection of tariff barriers between our counties! Consider further that trade is the natural way by which the special local advantages of climate, resources or skill are shared by all; and that man has ever striven to render trade easy and cheap by improving means of transportation. Commerce is divinely ordained, and civilization is founded thereon, for commerce is one of the chief methods whereby men co-operate with one another. Indeed, properly viewed, commerce exemplifies the co-operative motto: "Each for all and all for each."

I submit, therefore, with all confidence, that the logical and effective way of stimulating industry, and so increasing Canada's production that we may be able to meet our financial obligations and at the same time maintain a reasonable degree of comfort for ourselves is for us to unshackle industry. Take every tax off industry and allow the utmost freedom of trade. Only thus will those industries develop properly which are suited for our conditions; only thus can we successfully meet the situation which we find forced upon us at the end of the war.

And I submit further, that in view of Canada's great domain and resources, agriculture must remain the chief, or one of the chief, of Canadian industries; and that, therefore, it is particularly advantageous from the standpoint of production to remove any artificial disabilities under which agriculture labors, one of which unquestionably is the tariff. And in this connection I desire to draw your attention to the recently promulgated "Farmers' Platform," in which is presented a national policy best calculated to advance the interests of Canada as a whole. And I quote with pleasure the following editorial comment from the *Ottawa Citizen*:

At this time, when many people in Canada are conscious of the need for economic and political readjustment, and while the old political parties have nothing of a comprehensive character to put before the country, the Canadian Council's lead is clear and straightforward. It outlines an enlightened way forward for Canada; and there has never been a better time than the present, when Canadian industry must begin to build over again, to re-establish the country on the sound economic basis of production by labor applied to the natural resources of Canada.

There is another aspect of the problem of production that will bear mention at this point, if only in outline; and it is one, too, in which the Farmers' Platform meets the situation. Abundant production will largely depend upon equity in distribution. No man will continue to sow where he cannot reap; and in the proportion that a man's just earnings are taken from him he will become a discouraged and inefficient producer. Slavery of any kind does not conduce to economical production. Moreover, to the extent that people get what they do not earn, they usually squander or mispend it. I have been much impressed with the growth of flunkiness in Canada during the last twenty-five years, nowhere, perhaps, so evident as in this city of Toronto. Even during the time of war, when everyone was called to do something useful—when farmers were bidden speed up production, and when men, women

and children in the country worked as they had never worked before—even at such a time I noticed in this city hundreds of able-bodied men ministering to the extravagant wants of the rich. Lack of equity in the distribution of wealth, therefore, does not only produce discouraged workers, but withdraws thousands from useful occupations and turns them into flunkeys. And in this respect the Farmers' Platform will accomplish much by securing greater equity in the distribution of wealth. I commend the Farmers' Platform as being of special significance in the programme of industrial reconstruction.

Now, to sum up: Enduring industrial reconstruction can only be built upon a foundation of social and economic justice. To so build will involve the substitution of co-operation and industrial democracy for competition and industrial autocracy. The menace of strained industrial relations can only be averted by the spirit of unselfishness, manifesting itself in the democratization of industry, so that a substantial reunion of land-owner, capitalist and laborer may gradually take place. And efficient abundant production, so greatly needed in Canada, will largely depend upon those fiscal changes recommended in the Farmers' Platform. Industrial reconstruction on other lines is to rebuild on the sand.

May I suggest, finally, that civilization be likened to a magnificent building, each stone or part of which is a human being. The integrity and stability of the whole depends upon the foundation, the harmonious co-ordination of the parts, and the reliability of each unit or part. The philosophy of democracy does not, therefore, exalt the individual life without good reason. It is vital to the existence of society that each citizen be trained to know and do his duty; and, on the other hand, each citizen finds his own welfare bound up with that of society. There is good sense as well as good sentiment in Tennyson's beautiful couplet, with which I shall close:

"Let each man find his own in all men's good,
"And all men work in noble brotherhood."

Reconstruction in Industrial Life

ADDRESS BY DR. SAMUEL ZANE BATTEN, PHILADELPHIA.

IT is certainly a very great privilege to be here at this side of the line, that invisible line that we hope has practically disappeared. It was almost worth while to have had such a disaster as this war to bring together the two branches of the Anglo-Saxon race and to make us one from this time forward. I think that is the most promising outlook for the future of our world.

Some years ago, at a political meeting in New York City, Henry George was announced to speak to the working men. He was introduced by the Chairman as a man who had always stood for the working men. Mr. George rose to his feet and said: "I am not for the working man"—and a chill fell over the audience—"I am not for the rich man"—the temperature rose just a little—"But I am for men, without any reference whatever to their standing; for men, whether they are rich or poor, whether they are white or black." Now, so far as I know myself, this afternoon I want that to represent my attitude—FOR MEN. And industry must always be viewed in its relation to men and to society; and the industrial system is not to be considered as an end in itself. Always, everywhere the human value must be taken into account; always, everywhere, we must ask ourselves how this is affecting the life of men, of the child, of women, how it is related to the family, and I am inclined to think that that may be the test of the rightness or the wrongness of a good many of the problems in our present economic life. How do they affect the family? That is good for man or for society which helps the family; that is evil in industry for man and for society which injuriously affects the family. Let the family be our standard; let it be the test by which we shall measure the value of the processes of industry.

Some years ago a pastor of a church in one of our eastern manufacturing centres told me this story: He had been preaching on the golden rule, and said, "This is Christ's law for life, and it is our business to apply that law in our relations to society, in industry and in politics, as well as in the family and the church." A member of his church came to see him, a man who had some five thousand men working for him in a great steel mill, and he said, "Pastor, I am interested in what you have been saying, and I want

to get my business on a Christian basis. Now tell me what to do? I cannot increase the wages of the men very much with conditions as they are; we try to treat the men kindly, but there must be something beyond that." And that pastor, relating the incident to me, said, "Batten, I did not know what in the world to tell him."

Now, friends, the times of that ignorance and incompetency God may wink at, but He is expecting His church to-day to act more wisely than that. We must be able to tell earnest men, working men, employers, citizens, what we must do in order to get our industrial life on a Christian basis, and mere exhortations about being good and living good lives will not answer the question.

As I look around the world to-day there is one great outstanding movement of our day that is significant—the steady, irresistible coming up of the people out of a place of subjection into a place of authority. It has been affirmed here this afternoon that democracy is to be the watchword of our time, and you are all familiar with the words of the President when we entered the war—rather late some of us think, but in time to be there at the finish. "We enter this war in order that we might make the world safe for democracy." Now, friends, if we are to make the world safe for democracy we must do something more than merely talk about democracy. We must interpret the democratic principle; we must interpret it, because we have been talking about it for generations now; and then we must set ourselves resolutely to the task of practising that principle all along the line of life, and go with democracy just as far as democracy goes.

What is implied in democracy? We will see the relation of that in just a moment to this question of industry. You know how the French have three words, which, in a sense, are the embodiment of democracy: Liberty, Equality, Fraternity. Thus far we have thrown emphasis upon liberty. We have said very little about equality, and practically nothing about fraternity. In our day we are called upon to give a positive, constructive meaning of democracy.

I want to say a word with reference to that second word, equality. I am inclined to think, friends, that we deceive ourselves sometimes by the use of words. But in regard to that word equality, we all believe now, we hold its truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal. But a great many people are befogging themselves because they misunderstand the word Equality, and confuse it with likeness. We believe in the equality of men; we do not believe in the likeness of men. There are differences that may not be inequalities in every one of us as we believe

there is an outplanting of the Divine Life; and that human life in every one of us in itself and of itself is substantially the same thing wherever you find it, and if it manifests itself in very different ways, that is due largely to the handling that it has received. In other words, life, because it is life always and everywhere, in itself and of itself, is substantially equal. Now, the sociologist is prepared earnestly and solemnly to maintain that position. Some of you have read, by Leslie T. White, "Applied Sociology," proving that in all classes of men there is substantially the same power; that if power manifests itself in very different ways, it is not due to any inequality in life itself, but rather to the differences.

Now, let us assume, then, that men are essentially equal, and human life has substantially the same humanistic and Divine quality. That being the case, it ought everywhere to have fair and equal opportunities.

We recognize differences among men, of course, and these are necessary, because it takes all kinds of folk to make the world, and I suppose that lets us in somewhere, but differences are different from inequalities, and let us not lose sight of that. We challenge inequality then in human life; we challenge its right to be. We say human life, always and everywhere, ought to be developed and be strong and have a good, fair chance in the world to make the most of itself. The ways of life, of course, will be very different, because we have different aptitudes.

That illustrates one aspect of this term democracy that I believe needs emphasis in our time, and we are here this afternoon, not to stand merely for things as they are, and say because things have been, because one generation, by coming a little earlier, gain possession of the land and natural resources of the earth, they are to transmit those privileges to other generations and shut out the great mass of people from their equity in that common inheritance. We say other generations ought to have an equal opportunity to enjoy its equity of all the natural resources of the earth. That, we must believe, is implied in the term democracy.

The great problem before us to-day is the dethronement of autocracy wherever you find it, and the enthronement of democracy and equality and brotherhood among men.

It may be hard to say that our present industrial system is not a democratic system. For the last one hundred and fifty years society, in its political relations at any rate, has been growing more and more democratic, and we have an approximation of democracy in political relations, but it is significant that in the last one hundred and fifty years industry has been growing more and more

autocratic, so that to-day the control of industry is in practically a very few hands.

Several years ago Chauncey Depew said, and he had the privilege of representing the point of view of the capitalist, "There are seven men in this country who could stop every train and every railroad; they could shut down every factory in this land," and he said, "because they control capital." Now, I am not prepared to say just what that is. I am free to say that is not democracy, where a few men control the resources of the nation in the way of production and transportation and distribution. It is due to our present industrial system, in part—and keep this in mind, because I think it is so essential in what we are dealing with this afternoon, not men, but conditions and systems—sometimes we find an individual who represents the system, but we are more or less a part of the system and can hardly help ourselves, and the only way in which we can extricate ourselves is by changing the system. We will play according to the rules of the game; if you want a man to play differently you must change the rules. Our business to-day is to change the rules of the industrial game.

Just note the present industrial system. As a result of the industrial revolution we find a large scale industry with incorporated management, and this means on one hand we have investors, who may be one man or a few men practically controlling the industry, and then on the other hand we find the workers—sometimes hundreds or many thousands—separated and in another group. By the very nature of the case the relation between them is the competitive relation, and that very system has de-personalized the relations of men. That is one of the most significant changes that has ever come over the world; we have broken human fellowship.

Some five years ago I was a member of the committee representing the Federal Council of the Church of Christ in America to investigate the strikes in the Colorado mines. We went out to Colorado; we heard the testimony that was given, and this is what we found: That the principal stockholder, the man who held 52 per cent. of the stock in the chief gold mining company there, testified he had not been in Colorado for eleven years; knew nothing about conditions out there; did not know whether the men had a grievance or not. And I heard working men say that they offered to meet the employers and the managers, and they told them if they could only meet and talk over things they were perfectly sure that every question could be settled. And Ex-Senator Patterson said: "I would not meet these men; I would not remain in the

same room with them for the Governor of Colorado; I would not remain in the same room with these men for the President of the United States." And, men and women, where such an attitude as that exists you have all the conditions for misunderstanding, for friction, for warfare, for bloodshed. You de-personalize human relationships; in other words, you have de-humanized human beings.

The industrial process as we know it to-day is, in a very large part, a mechanical process. I just want to say this one thing in regard to that, that we have destroyed the worker's joy of workmanship. The time was when one man made a pair of shoes; now it takes one hundred men to do it. One man could have some satisfaction in his work; to-day a man simply touches the form of the shoe as it passes through his hand. There can be no joy of workmanship there. There can be no creative impulse developed in that man. We have destroyed the worker's incentive to do his best.

I have heard employers say, "Well, I cannot get the men to take any interest in my business." Frankly, why should they? MY BUSINESS. There is not any such thing as private business to-day. There is no business so small as to be purely private. It touches men and society, and wherever business touches others and has social relations, it ceases to be a purely personal thing. MY BUSINESS—why should a man take any interest in it? He knows that if he does his best he will be set up as a postmark for others, and he believes, whether rightly or wrongly, that he will get no benefit himself.

I am not discussing the question this afternoon whether the worker is right or wrong in that; the state of mind is the fact, and you must deal with that. He believes he is not getting a square deal; that there is no reason in the world why he should exert himself to the utmost.

Just summing up then, this is what we find: That the present wage system is working badly; it has practically broken down on our hands, and the wise students of industrial questions, whether working man or employer, will admit that the wage system has broken down on our hands. There are some employers who are trying to patch up the system by bonuses and other things. These are good so far as they go, but they do not deal with the fundamental relations, and they do not carry us one inch towards the solution of the problem.

(To be continued in our next issue).



The Provincial Board of Health of Ontario

Cases and Deaths for the Month of February, 1919

THE total deaths from all causes reported by the Undertakers for the Province during the month of February are 3,331. Of this number Spanish Influenza and Pneumonia caused 812 or 24.3% of the whole. It is satisfactory to know the reports show a great improvement in the last month compared with the previous months of the epidemic. The marked decrease for February indicates the outbreak is abating as the figures for the several months show: October 3,015, November 2,608, December 1,568, January 1,512, February 812 deaths. Total 9,515. Included in the last month are some 150 deaths that took place in the previous months, but not reported until now, and if deducted would make the deaths for February 662 instead of 812.

The following are some of the cities and towns reporting the most deaths: Toronto 129, Hamilton 24, Sault St. Marie 35, Brantford 18, Ottawa 57, Windsor 15, Kingston 7, St. Catharines 9, London 14, Sudbury 27, Parry Sound 7, Stratford 6, Port Arthur 5, Fort William 3, Guelph 4, Niagara Falls 15, Welland 4, Smiths Falls 14, Carleton Place 6, Belleville 3, Chatham 12, Wiarton 3, Kenora 4, Petrolia 3, Brockville 4, Merrickville 4, North Bay 9, Port Hope 5, Victoria Harbor 4, Cornwall 4, Burlington 7.

COMPARATIVE TABLE.

<i>Diseases.</i>	1919		1918	
	<i>Cases.</i>	<i>Deaths.</i>	<i>Cases.</i>	<i>Deaths.</i>
	<i>Feby.</i>		<i>Feby.</i>	
Smallpox.....	41	0	91	0
Scarlet Fever.....	337	11	357	4
Diphtheria.....	329	32	289	18
Measles.....	21	1	861	6
Whooping Cough.....	41	2	168	6
Typhoid.....	12	3	35	3
Tuberculosis.....	226	144	131	69
Infantile Paralysis.....	0	0	1	0
Cerebro-Spinal Meningitis....	14	13	15	10
	1021	206	1948	116

VENEREAL DISEASES REPORTED BY MEDICAL OFFICERS OF HEALTH FOR FEBRUARY 1919.

	<i>Feb.</i> 1919	<i>Jan.</i> 1919
	<i>Cases.</i>	<i>Cases.</i>
Syphilis.....	85	125
Gonorrhoea.....	153	138
Chancroid.....	5	1*
	243	264

NOTE—Hereditary Syphilis caused 7 deaths of babies under 3 months old.

SMALLPOX CASES FOR MONTH OF FEBRUARY 1919.

Toronto.....	2
Hamilton.....	1
Brantford.....	3
Ottawa.....	6
North Bay.....	1
Chatham.....	1
Erieau Village.....	3
Rodney.....	1
Ross Tp.....	6
Pembroke and Vicinity.....	5
Beachburg and Vicinity.....	8
Oliver Tp.....	1
Westmeath Tp.....	2
Sellett Tp.....	1
	41

The Schick Test

The Schick Test is a means whereby it can be shown whether or not a given individual is immune to diphtheria.

The principle of the test is that in a person susceptible to diphtheria—and it appears that many are naturally immune—a local irritation is set up around the site of a subcutaneous injection of a minute dose of diphtheria toxin. One fiftieth of the minimal lethal dose (1/50 M.L.D.) of diphtheria toxin for a guinea pig of 250 to 300 grams weight is the usual quantity employed. If no reaction occurs then at least one-twentieth of a unit of diphtheria anti-toxin is present in the patient's blood and he is probably safe from attack. If the reaction is positive then the assumption is that there is less than one-fortieth of a unit of diphtheria anti-toxin present, indicating that a prophylactic dose should be administered. The test, assuming its reliability, would appear to be most valuable in the case of an outbreak of diphtheria in an institution where, by its application, the susceptibles and non-susceptibles may be separated and only the former need be treated with anti-toxin instead of all and sundry.

Editorial

The Federal Department of Health

WE congratulate the Dominion Government on having definitely announced that a bill is to be introduced forthwith providing the necessary authority for the establishment of a Federal Department of Health. We trust that this Department may be only the forerunner of a Federal Ministry of Health. That an independent department be set up under a Minister of Cabinet rank, is not too much to ask, if the all-vital problems to be solved are to receive the consideration they merit, judged solely from the point of view of the nation's welfare.

The problems of public health, social welfare and the co-ordination of the activities of all existing agencies dealing with preventive and curative medicine in Canada, must be reviewed and if possible so systematized that Canada will come to occupy a foremost place amongst the nations who regard the health of their citizens as their most priceless asset.

Toronto Department of Health Estimates

At a recent meeting of Toronto Board of Control according to newspaper accounts the sum of \$5,170.00 was deleted from the estimates of the Department of Health "as a beginning". A controller named McBride who has been very active in his opposition to expenditures on health opposed the payment of doctors and nurses taking baby clinics throughout the city. "The mothers of to-day are as well able to look after their children as your mother and my mother" remarked this sapient individual. Dr. Hastings replied that the infant mortality of Toronto had been reduced from 100 to 85 by organized methods, adding that the Board of Control were putting their judgment above that of the best informed medical men of the country. Whereupon the controller replied "Our judgment is going to go here". After another controller stated that he would "vote to strike this item out as a fad", the item \$2,600 was allowed to stand on a vote of 3 to 2.

This incident is pretty characteristic of proceedings in Toronto Board of Control. Toronto has one of the most efficient medical officers of health on the continent. He has admittedly got results in that during

his administration the death rate of Toronto has fallen steadily. Yet he is submitted year by year to badgering and baiting particularly by one controller who to his own great delight frequently carries his point and robs his city of some absolutely necessary piece of health administration. There would be little criticism of this action were it carried through as a result of intelligent consideration. But more's the pity it never is. Wind and bluster seem to carry the day where all other methods fail. We cannot but wonder how much longer Toronto will tolerate this ridiculous annual spectacle.

An Incorrect Point of View

The December number of the Bulletin of the Council for Social Service of the Church of England in Canada is devoted to an article on "The Social Evil". While it is most gratifying that the Bulletin should pay attention to a subject which is so important there are some features of the article in question which would seem to merit criticism in that they unfortunately provide examples of the attitude of mind which workers in the field of social hygiene find it necessary to combat.

A quotation from the first paragraph of the article runs as follows: "an evil . . . which has existed since the world began and will exist till the world ends, an ineradicable fact of society, and one which has to be faced and met with such means as may be devised, without any hope of final and complete victory, and with no possibility of doing any more than lessening its evils". Again in the next paragraph: "There is no conceivable hope for ever eradicating the social evil completely and finally, and that she whose house is the way to hell, going down to the chambers of death, will be with us always". These statements remind one very much of the arguments one used to hear in favour of retaining the bar because it has always been an institution. It always has been. Therefore it always shall be. Surely the writer is unduly pessimistic.

On the following page the statement is made that the matter of combating venereal disease is totally and altogether a matter for the medical profession and generally left alone by the layman. The writer seems to be unaware that some of the best work done in this matter has been done by laymen. He should investigate the work of Mr. Wm. H. Zinnser of the Social Hygiene Division of the American Training Camp Activities Commission, of Mrs. Gotto of the British National Council for Combating Venereal Diseases or of Dr. Winnifred Cullis—who by the way is not a Doctor of Medicine.

The reason for women entering a life of prostitution is then discussed. In one place the statement is made: "They are of such a frivolous and

pleasure-loving disposition that they are deliberately willing to take the plunge rather than continue their hum-drum existence"; and again: "There are in every city scores of institutions of the very best description willing to give such lonely girls a warm welcome". The fact is that quite a number of girls are "frivolous and pleasure-loving" in some degree. Indeed it would be a dull world if one didn't run across that sort occasionally. The institutions the writer speaks of may exist. It is quite certain that up to the present time they are utterly inadequate in number and in conception of the problems of social hygiene.

In the discussion of the policy of regulation of disorderly houses the statement is made: "It may also be admitted that medical regulation of the women does very considerably lower the rate of disease, the undoubted figures from many European cities leave no question on that score". This statement is simply not in accord with the facts. The attempt to regulate and inspect has disastrous results wherever it is tried. It does not decrease but greatly increases both the sum total of exposures to infection and the amount of venereal disease. Fortunately, however, the writer goes on to say that medical inspection is the most partial of palliations and does not begin to keep down disease. He also disagrees with the policy of segregation—and in this attitude he is in accord with all authorities.

While the article under discussion is marked by good intentions and contains some valuable material its usefulness is greatly lessened by statements which show a lack of scientific knowledge and an incorrect point of view. To pretend to attack the problems of prostitution and venereal disease and commence by saying that prostitution must always exist is absurd. The prostitute is a social phenomenon whose existence depends on definite remediable social causes. She will continue to exist only as long as those causes remain. We should study them carefully and act accordingly—not with the idea of ameliorating or palliating, but of abolishing. Neither is repression the essential method although some of this there must be at first. Only by definitely constructive social work aiming to provide a sane normal life for young people can much be accomplished. Abraham Flexner in his classical work on the subject says: "Civilization has stopped for a life-and-death struggle with tuberculosis, alcohol and other plagues. It is on the verge of a similar struggle with the crasser forms of commercialized vice. Sooner or later it must fling down the gauntlet to the whole horrible thing. This will be the real contest—a contest that will test the courage, the self-denial, the faith, the resources of humanity to their utmost". Flexner is right, but what fight is worth while that is not a hard one? Surely we should not confess ourselves defeated before the first gun is fired.

Medical Examination of Seamen

At the conference on venereal disease control held in Ottawa on February 3rd, among other important matters under discussion was the medical examination of seamen for the detection of venereal disease. In the United States examination of crews has been provided for and carried out since February 5th, 1917, by an amendment of the Immigration Act relating to the medical examination of alien seamen, putting the latter on the same footing as regular immigrants. In Canada except for quarantinable diseases there is no medical inspection of seamen. This means that while a ship is in port her seamen are free to transmit venereal and other diseases which they have acquired. The following extract from the 1918 annual report of the United States Public Health Service is of interest in this connection.

EXTRACT ANNUAL REPORT 1918 U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

ALIEN SEAMEN INSPECTED AND CERTIFIED.

(Only for larger seaport stations).

IMPORTANT DISEASES FOR WHICH CERTIFICATION WAS MADE.

	Inspected	Certified	Trachoma	Tuberculosis	Insanity	Epilepsy	Feeble-minded	Favus	Syphilis	Soft Chancre	Gonorrhoea
Baltimore, M.D.....	22768	1332	9	5	2	2	..	77	106	210	
Boston, Mass.....	21312	551	2	22	25	
Buffalo, N.Y.....	182	33	
Newport News and Norfolk Quarantine	42327	488	184	9	2	2	53	37	90
New Orleans, La.....	17161	489	47	4	..	1	..	1	75	70	85
New York, N.Y.....	166833	772	241	17	8	6	1	..	56	98	195
Pensacola, Fla.....	1431	37	13	8
Reedy Island Quarantine.....	26728	1043	66	7	1	..	14	49	48
Port Townsend, Wash.....	18155	100	7	20	12	18
San Francisco, Cal.....	47039	34	11	10	4	33

The Ottawa conference passed the following resolution: "That this conference suggests that all seamen coming within the purview of the Immigration Act be examined for freedom from Venereal Diseases before being allowed ashore at Canadian seaports". It is to be hoped that in view of the present entire lack of authority for dealing with the matter government action will follow immediately.

Joint Meeting of Canadian Public Health and Ontario Health Officers Association at Toronto on May 26th, 27th and 28th.

